nutritional value foods that we talk about.

And that is what you are going to end up doing here.

Now, let me tell you about Michael and his family to finish this. Well, I do not have time, but let us just remember in this debate, this is not about numbers. This is about people with real problems, and we need to be careful.

IN SUPPORT OF THE DEAL SUBSTITUTE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to say to my colleague from Georgia and the others over there that, yes, we do thank your leadership for bringing up some of these issues that we have worked very hard on over the past 3 years. And I guess I can say that, as a newer Member, I also think it is important that we shed our pettiness in terms of who is bringing up the issues and look more at what is happening to the American people. I think that is one of the objectives that I and many of the other colleagues that I have shared this bill with, the Deal substitute bill, in trying to put people above politics, and that is a very important issue that we have to do right now.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LINCOLN. I yield to the gen-

tleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thought it was the Democrat chart that had a T shape on our plan versus your plans. I was only

responding to your plan.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just think it is very important for the American people to know our group and the bill that we have produced is very nonpartisan. It is a very practical bill. It is very realistic. And we are here because we want to put people before politics. That is what is important, taking the American people, looking at what their needs are.

Tomorrow we will have the options of looking at the bill offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the Deal bill, and the Republican Contract bill.

We have worked hard. We have produced a bill that is really realistic in terms of what it does for the American people and in terms of what it does for this Nation in long-term getting people off of welfare, and that is what we want. We do not want to just throw them off of welfare. We want to get them off of welfare, get them off of the generational dependency and put them into a constructive, contributing life style.

People have a tendency really to ignore the voice of reason, and I think really that is what we have got to present in the Deal bill is real reason,

looking at what people need to survive and to become independent.

It is time that we finally hear what that voice of reason is. We have talked about priorities tonight. Are you going to talk about food and making sure children get fed, or are you going to talk about \$20 billion to \$40 billion of increases in military spending? Are you going to talk about putting people back to work and giving them the opportunity to provide for themselves? That is what is important. We have got to look at where this Nation is spending its money.

In terms of percentages, if you look at the money we are spending on both military, on interest, on the debt, the talks we have had here tonight in terms of nutrition, less than 0.1 percent are a drop in the bucket in what we need to do, and our voice of reason, the Deal substitute, puts more people to work than the alternative bills that will be offered tomorrow.

The Deal substitute is the only one that devotes its entire savings to deficit reduction, and if you are serious about deficit reduction for your children and your children's children, you have got to realize that we have got to put those savings toward deficit reduction. We realize the same amount of savings roughly that the Republican plan does, but we direct our savings to deficit reduction, because we are worried about the future of our children, not only in welfare reform, but also in deficit reduction.

The Deal substitute recognizes that it is impossible to work without proper job training and child care. You cannot ask a single mother to work for her benefits if she has nowhere to take her children.

And, yes, you are right, the family structure in this Nation is deteriorating, and that young woman does not have the support network of a family, a grandparent or a parent to look after that child. She has got to depend on some child care, and we have got to provide it, and we do in the Deal substitute. We not only provide it, but we pay for it, and that is an important part of what we do.

The Deal substitute identifies the problems that have been created in the crazy checks abuse, and it solves the problem. I have seen a tremendous amount of that problem in my district, and I have been working hard over these past years to look for a reasonable solution that does not throw out the baby with the bath water. It does not put that child with cerebral palsy out on the street, but it makes sure the disabled children, especially those that are multiply disabled, are going to be helped, but the ones that are abusing the programs, those loopholes will be closed.

The Deal substitute is the only one that sets a 2-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits, the only program that is going to be offered that sets a 2-year lifetime limit.

We give the States the option of extending benefits for 2 more years with

community service, and that is what we have heard from most people is that the States know better how to craft and to recraft those programs to get their people back into the work force.

The Deal substitute gives States more flexibility than any other proposal without passing massive costs on to the States, no unfunded mandates. We do not produce the unfunded mandates, because we know it is unrealistic, and in the long run it will not work.

The Deal substitute does not demand family caps. Instead, we give that flexibility to the States, that option of denying additional benefits to mothers who have more children while on welfare.

The Deal substitute includes welfare benefits as taxable income. It is the best alternative you are going to get, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

WELFARE REFORM AND DEFICIT REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see my good friend from Ohio in the chair tonight.

At the outset, I yield to my good friend from Georgia for a moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say one thing about the Deal alternative. I do agree, Mr. Speaker, with the previous speaker. It is the best alternative that is out there, not as good as H.R. 4, the Republican plan, but in terms of an alternative, I agree that the moderate Democrats are showing some leadership over there, and I hope maybe you can inspire your official leaders to show some leadership, too.

One thing though I do want to say about the Democrats' newfound interest in deficit reduction is that, you know, for since 1969, the Democrats have controlled the House, and each year we have a new debt. Now, I say since 1969; that is the last time we had a balanced budget, but year after year the deficit has gone up.

But I say this: It is a Republican and A Democrat obligation to address it, because I believe both parties created the deficit, and I am glad now that both of us are talking about it, and let us have this one-upmanship. Let us see who can top each other's deficit-reduction plan. That is what two parties are all about.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just wanted to reemphasize the fact if we are really truly talking about deficit reduction that all of what we have been talking about in terms of cuts, rescissions, and certainly in the welfare reform and the